

## REMARKS

In the Office Action,<sup>1</sup> the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,182,094 to Humpleman et al. ("*Humpleman*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,526,130 to Kim ("*Kim*"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 to Alexander et al. ("*Alexander*").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Humpleman* in view of *Kim* and further in view of *Alexander* because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

Claim 1, for example, recites an information processing device adapted to be connected to other information processing devices by way of a network comprising, among other things:

display means for displaying a warning indicating double booking of recording reservations to a user and displaying the cause of the double booking, regardless of whether the cause of double booking is located on the information processing device or on a second processing device in the network.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that the combination of *Humpleman* in view of *Kim* fails to disclose "displaying means for displaying a warning indicating double booking of recording reservations to a user and displaying the cause of the double booking, according to the first and second pieces of information." The Examiner, however, relies on *Alexander* as disclosing the claimed display means (Office Action

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

at p. 3). However, *Alexander* fails to disclose the display means as recited in amended claim 1.

According to the Examiner, *Alexander*, at col. 12, line 53 to col. 13, line 22, discloses, “when, ‘[i]f the detects an overlap in date, time in the record list, the EPG formats a message to the viewer describing the conflict.’” The Examiner further states that *Alexander* discloses, “the cause of the double booking in accord to the second pieces of information” (Office Action at p. 3).

*Alexander* discloses an EPG (Electronic Programming Guide). The EPG’s record function recognizes conflicts in viewer record instructions (col. 12, lines 53-55). *Alexander*, however, relates to television systems (col. 1, lines 37-38; col. 3, lines 1-7; col. 6, lines 63-65 and col. 8, lines 38-43). Claim 1, as amended, recites display means for displaying the cause of the double booking, regardless of whether the cause of double booking is located on the information processing device or on a second processing device in the network.

Because *Alexander* fails to disclose a network, as recited in claim 1, it cannot disclose display means for displaying a cause of double booking regardless of whether the cause is located on the information processing device or on a second device. In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the television system of *Alexander* with *Humpleman* and *Kim* as suggested by the Examiner. None of *Humpleman*, *Kim*, or *Alexander*, taken alone or in any reasonable combination, teaches or suggests each and every element recited by independent claim 1. Therefore, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to this claim.

Independent claims 8 and 15, although of different scope than claim 1, distinguish over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to claims 8 and 15. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Humpleman* in view of *Kim* and further in view of *Alexander*.

Claims 2-7 and 9-14 depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 8. In addition, each of the dependent claims may recite unique combinations that are neither taught nor suggested by prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 7, 2007

By:



Michael R. Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,921